

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AREA STUDY
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

MONTHLY REPORT #5
OCTOBER 2001

PREPARED FOR:
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ZONING

PREPARED BY:
DUANY PLATER-ZYBERK & COMPANY

STUDY TEAM:
PATRICIA BIDOL-PADVA, DEBRA CHILDS, ROBERT FREILICH, MARINA KHOURY, DOUGLAS KRIEGER, MICHAEL LAUER,
ELIZABETH PLATER-ZYBERK, TYSON SMITH, PAUL TISCHLER & IAN WATSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TASKS	1
MEETING MINUTES (SEPTEMBER 2001)	2
MONTHLY ACTIVITIES BY CONSULTANT	7
CONTINGENT VALUATION - Krieger Presentation	10
AGENDA (for CAC Meeting 10-18-01)	14
FREILICH, LEITNER & CARLISLE (Firm history and R. Freilich Resume)	15

1. ONGOING TASKS (this month)

TASK 1: INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

Task 1a: Environmental & Physical Analysis of Agricultural Land Use Practices

Task 1b: Agriculture and Agribusiness Update (UF under separate contract)

Task 1f: Fiscal Impact (DouglasKrieger's sub-task only)

TASK 3: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Task 3a: Citizens' Advisory Committee

Task 3b: Related Studies Coordination

2. COMPLETED TASKS

NONE

3. NEW TASKS (beginning at month 6)

Task 1d: Direct Agricultural Support Uses

Task 1e: Complementary Rural Land Uses

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL AREA STUDY, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

Cooperative Extension, 18710 SW 288th Street, Homestead, Florida

September 20th 2001

Board Members Present

Craig Wheeling (Chairman)
Ron Weeks (Vice-Chairman)
Ivonne Alexander
John Alger
April Gromnicki (nominee)
Noble Hendrix
Bill Losner
Phil Marraccini
Cooper McMillan
Reed Olszack
Karsten Rist
Erik Tietig

Board Members Absent

Santiago Garcia
Santiago Iglesias
James Pierce
Brent Probinsky

Minutes

I. Call to Order

- Craig Wheeling opened the meeting asking all in attendance to remember those fallen in September 11 attacks.
- A committee member suggested a minute of silence.

II. Approval of Agenda and Meeting Minutes

- The minutes of the 8.16.01 meeting received unanimous approval. There was no discussion.

III. Committee charge

- Jerry Bell read into the record a letter to the CAC from Diane O'Quinn Williams, Director of Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning, reviewing the charge to the CAC and reminding the members of the CAC that community input is part of that charge. J. Bell explained that this applies as well to the CAC's review of the University of Florida's work.

- A committee member asked if any member of the CAC had been involved in drafting UF's contract. The Chair explained that a working group, chaired by John Folks, developed the scope and the contract prior to the CAC's formation. The State of Florida set up the contract and U.F. must live up to the contract.
- The Committee continued its discussion, reiterating the importance of the CAC reviewing the work of all consultants prior to the final report.
- The suggestion was made to request such a review of U.F.'s work as per the contract. Further discussion led the Chair to suggest that he would send a letter to John Folks regarding the need and contractual obligation for the CAC to review U.F.'s work in draft form, with copies to M. Roberts and C. Bronson.
- The Chair read from the contract the prescribed interaction with the CAC, the public, and other agencies.
- It was suggested the letter also mention that time is of the essence.
- A motion was made and unanimously approved for the Chair to send such a letter.

IV. Committee Ground Rules

- Pat Bidol-Padva explained that conversations with committee members after the last meeting encouraged her to remind the group of the ground rules for committee meetings. She recounted two anecdotes by unidentified members. She suggested that interactive facilitation techniques might result in more constructive dialogue. She will facilitate all future consultant presentations, returning the meeting to the Chair following the consultants' presentation and for the discussion when motions may be desired. PBP described the method of interactive discussion, to be followed by sequential summaries by each CAC member.

V. Sub-consultant Report

- PBP introduced Dr. Douglas Krieger.
- Dr. Krieger described his background in natural resources and agricultural economics in applying economic tools to real world situations with a focus on land use and farmland preservation, and his work with local governments in Michigan. His area of expertise is contingent valuation. He explained his objectives for Task 1f. was to determine the contingent valuation of non-market benefits. Beyond market-oriented benefits that can be quantified, agricultural land has other benefits worth measuring: farmland is valued for scenic beauty, its contribution to quality of life, and wildlife habitat. In recent years, of over 200 local referenda on open space preservation throughout U.S., over 70% were passed. The benefits are difficult to value in financial terms. Contingent valuation is one of three methods for valuing qualitative benefits.
- A CAC member pointed out that ours is a unique area: the single largest loss of farm land has been to national parks. The land has \$3-4,000/acre agricultural value; \$25-25,000/acre development value. Farmers have paid development prices for farmland. Any public purchase will have to buy development rights.
- D.K. said that he appreciates that. He is familiar with a county in Michigan with similar development pressures. Purchasing development rights is a frequent proposal. A key issue is what development rights are worth to the people who will be purchasing them. Some farmers choose to sell for what the public is willing to pay - others choose to keep the land.
- A CAC member said land values are higher than just mentioned: between \$35,000/acre and \$50,000/acre.

- D.K. responded that a market value cost benefit analysis of a voluntary purchasing program must assess whether the benefits are worth the cost.
- Another CAC member pointed out that most acreage is rented land, “gypsyland”. He added that at 80,000 acres, development at 6 units per acre would bring 2 million more people to the area which would not be a good thing. The county sewage capacity is maxed-out. For \$1 of taxes ag. residents get \$0.35 services. A CAC member said this study is not about farmland preservation: it is about agricultural retention. He referred to the eastern shore of Maryland where land reverted to scrub after it was set aside for preservation.
- Another member mentioned the issue of absentee landlords.
- D.K.: part of the charge for his task is broader input beyond the CAC. Responding to an earlier question regarding method, he uses two approaches: a qualitative method which will involve group discussions, and a quantitative method which will involve a mail survey of the County.
 - o The qualitative approach starts with focus groups of 8-10 people randomly but representatively selected; structured but informal discussions assist DK in developing and designing a questionnaire for the mail survey. Questions might include: Is farmland preservation part of public awareness? What connection do people have with farmland? What importance is given to farmland; What are the preferences for alternate development scenarios?
 - o Six focus groups, several in Spanish, will be drawn from throughout the County. The report of the focus groups’ findings (maintaining anonymity) provides a sense of attitudes about farmland value. This is followed by a mail survey, encompassing several thousand residents county-wide, urban and outlying, in English and in Spanish.
 - o The goal is to quantify preferences for farmland preservation and estimate monetary value of non-market benefits of alternate scenarios, placing an economic value on non-market value.
 - o An example of contingent valuation in Lelenaw County, Michigan laid out the impacts of preserving farmland and agricultural industry retention, suggesting a referendum vote dedicated to the purchase price of farmland.
- A CAC member commented that the County has 150,000 pop. for each farmer, voicing concern that survey results could be detrimental to the farmer.
- Another asked, can we see the questionnaire before it goes out?
- D.K. answered, yes.
- Again the concern was voiced that response to the survey may be discouraging. Surveys do not tend to generate large response. Miami-Dade County is unique and complex, needs a tailored process.
- D.K. summarized that valuation will produce answers to the questions: Why is agricultural retention important? What about it is important? To whom is it important?
- A CAC member reminded that the study is for agricultural retention not farmland preservation saying: “there is no farmland without a farmer.”
- A CAC member asked: How do you apply dollar value?
- D.K. responded, in a referendum setting: e.g. if it costs each household \$50/year to preserve farmland, would you be willing to pay? He acknowledged that some preservation factions include NIMBYism, but there tends to be an understanding of the need for habitat, and for agriculture as an industry. In Leelenaw County those benefits desired by farmers and those benefits desired by others were articulated by such a survey.

- A CAC member reminded that poor management of purchased land can be very costly. Management costs of conservation include keeping exotics out. Must be part of cost of preservation: there is an operating cost as well as capital cost.

The above discussion was followed by a group facilitation exercise in which each member was provided with an opportunity to express their comments about DK's proposed methodology and contingent valuation analysis. These comments were recorded on flip charts by Jerry Bell. These comments are as follows:

Verbatim transcripts from flip charts - 9/20/01 ARAS CAC Meeting Agenda Item V., Discussion of Task 1f. Contingent Valuation Analysis

James Pierce

- Interested in results, particularly in areas north and east of the development line
- Dramatic difference between what the agricultural area values farmland at, and what the developed area values farmland at

Philip Marraccini, Jr.

- Ask the average citizen in Dade County whether they will preserve farmland at a cost - will vote no
- Dollar value of taxation will give negative impression - most are anti-taxation
- More comfortable with US products - the U.S. must be more self-sufficient

Reed Olszack

- If survey with larger sample in outlying area, should recognize bias that respondents want more space
- When consultants come down, can CAC have samples of their work? Summary sheet would be very helpful.

Erik Tietig

- Lawsuits regarding takings can help determine how courts place value upon intrinsic land qualities

Ivonne Alexander

- Anticipates apathy on part of respondents in returning surveys based on experience with UF surveys
- CAC should review survey before it goes out
- Consultant should be prepared to deal with difficulties of the area
- Miami-Dade County is not comparable to Michigan

Bill Losner

- Listen to tapes
- In this Study, when it comes to property rights, make sure everyone's property rights are preserved

Cooper McMillan

- Domestic food production is a national security issue
- Open land management will incur increased costs
- Farmland preservation cannot occur without economically viable farms
- Informed, educated farmers are the best, cheapest managers of land

Noble Hendrix

- Informed, educated, empowered farmers are the best, cheapest managers of land
- Support the work of the Study - give all the information we [CAC] can
- This is the last chance to do this Study

April Gromnicki

- Educational component to survey form would be useful [i.e. include some information to give respondents background]
- Note benefits in questions so people understand implications

Karsten Rist

- Include that agriculture is a better neighbor to national parks than subdivisions in the survey
- Look at freshwater availability and costs when looking at increased population

John Alger

- If farmers were making a profit wouldn't have this issue
- Constitutional issue - danger of undervaluing
- Ensure land valued correctly

Craig Wheeling

- Failure of focus groups - ask what they want - when ask how much they'll pay -they won't pay
- Valuation can vanish. How move from non-monetary to monetary valuation with accuracy?

Ron Weeks

- CAC should see survey before it is sent out
- When ask a dollar amount - will find first layer of resistance
- In Dade County understand skepticism about use of public money

Bill Losner (2)

- Enjoys lifestyle in Redland which has 17,000 potential homesites
- Keep one house on five acres

Ivonne Alexander (2)

- Wants to see data comparing rural value of land (actual value) to urban contributory value
- On watershed plan, have issues of water quantity and quality

Erik Tietig (2)

- Disagrees about keeping five acre residential zoning - best way to preserve lifestyle is to concentrate population in subdivisions (cluster) - a buffer along the UDB will serve purposes
- Have to accommodate population

John Alger (2)

- Not talking about reducing density

Bill Losner (3)

- Runoff from farmland has to comply with water quality standards for parks

Cooper McMillan (2)

- If people have to pay full retail, can't afford to pay for land they own.
- Question - what % of farmers own farmland, what is location?

Erik Tietig (3)

- Include only those in Study Area

Ron Weeks (2)

- Study area should be population paying for rights - invalid if don't include all County

Cooper McMillan (3)

- Survey - informed - full cost accounting of options

Noble Hendrix (2)

- In looking at population willing to pay - separate out population in Study Area

James Pierce (2)

- Separately track in & out of Study Area
- Don't weigh because those in area will value more - not willing to pay

VI. Public comments followed

- Real value of land is its development right.
- What is the percentage of farmers owning the land they farm, and where is that land?

VII. Final committee response to consultant

- Study area should be population potentially paying for development rights.
- Make the survey fully informational.
- Survey entire county with 2 subgroups.
- P.B-P. said that the survey will be reviewed by the CAC; the tape of this meeting will be sent to the consultants.
- The Chair requested a straw vote on extent of County to be included in survey. The result: the survey scope is to include the entire county with identification of source of information whether within or outside agricultural land.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm

Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company (DPZ)

During the month of September, DPZ coordinated the on-going tasks between the various consultants in order to ensure the following: 1) make sure work is obtained and completed in a timely manner, according to the schedule; and 2) review consultant's deliverables. DPZ attended the fifth CAC meeting and produced meeting minutes for that meeting. DPZ also produced Monthly Report #5.

DPZ is in the process of compiling a list of all related studies (federal, state, municipal and county projects) that could impact our study area. DPZ has received a list of additional studies from some TAC Board members to be included in that task (Task 3b - Related Studies Coordination). The deadline for additional related projects recommended by the TAC and CAC was September 30th. DPZ will now be working with FLC to coordinate the format and presentation of these studies.

URS

URS has been working on the following items during this past month:

1. There has been a general review of the data received to date from UF and FPL to better support the suitability criteria creation and implementation.
2. URS is continuing to work on draft maps based on CAC comments.
3. URS has been working with Michael Lauer to discuss and further refine the suitability criteria, as well as to come up with a methodology to explain to the CAC how and in what way that criteria will be assessed for inclusion in the analysis and map atlas.

Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle (FLC)

Tyson Smith, an attorney with Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle, is continuing to work with Jerry Bell, the Project Manager, and Marina Khoury, of DPZ, in performing Task 3b- Related Studies Coordination; and specifically to ensure that the ongoing review of related studies is comprehensive in scope and includes previously-performed analyses that bear directly on the work of the Consultants and the County.

Additionally, Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle is preparing to begin Task 1f, Public Sector Fiscal Impact Analysis; which will be performed between September of 2001 and July of 2002, and will involve extensive input from a range of participating consultants. Both Robert Freilich and Tyson Smith will attend the October 18th meeting of the CAC to discuss on-going and upcoming tasks and to give an overview of future tasks to be performed over the duration of the Study.

Planning Works (sub-consultant to FLC)

Planning Works has been coordinating with URS to refine the suitability criteria and develop a base map for the mapping and testing of scenarios. URS should be able to present initial findings on agricultural suitability to the CAC in November or December 2001.

Additionally Planning Works has begun work on the identification of strategies to enhance the economic competitiveness of agriculture in conjunction with FLC. This work can only be completed when the University of Florida finishes their background report.

Tischler & Associates

Mr. Tischler expects to begin Task 1C- Economic Outlook in January 2002.

Douglas Krieger

Douglas Krieger presented his work plan for the focus groups to the CAC on September 20. At that meeting he discussed the rationale for the focus groups, the procedures for selecting participants, and reviewed the topics of discussion. The outline of his presentation is attached on the following pages. He expects to begin his focus group work in late November.

Outline of Presentation to Citizens' Advisory Committee

Krieger - September 13, 2001

Objectives

My role in this project is to “utilize contingent valuation or other comparable techniques to estimate the economic value of non-market benefits provided by agricultural, open and rural lands and uses in the study area.” These economic values “shall be incorporated into the cost-benefit analysis to more fully quantify the impacts, positive or negative, of implementing scenarios.” That’s what the scope of work says but what are “non-market benefits,” why are they important, and how are they measured?

Agricultural activities in Miami-Dade County generate both market and non-market impacts. Market impacts include the market value of crops, wages in the agricultural sector, and the revenue generated by agricultural processing and support industries. What these have in common is easily observed monetary prices. These prices are a measure of value. Agricultural land also produces goods and services that do not have easily estimated monetary values. In work I’ve done in other regions of the country, people tell me that protecting farmland maintains the scenic beauty and rural character of an area, that it contributes to a higher quality of life, and that it preserves wildlife habitat. You don’t have to look further than the many cases across the country where communities have approved tax increases to permanently protect farmland from development to see that these impacts of farmland are valuable - people are willing to pay substantial sums to keep farmland from being developed. In most cases, however, scenic beauty, rural character, quality of life, and wildlife habitat do not have prices so it is difficult to tell how much they are worth. Why is this important?

This project will develop four development scenarios for Miami-Dade County. Each of these scenarios will have implications for the quantity, type, and spatial pattern of agricultural and developed land use. Other parts of this study will estimate the various market benefits associated with each alternative and compare them to the costs of implementing the scenarios. To account for the full range of benefits associated with a particular development scenario, however, the value of non-market goods and services associated with each alternative must also be considered. In the remainder of this short presentation I’ll describe the methods I’ll use to identify and measure the non-market values associated with agricultural land use in Miami-Dade County.

Methods

I use both qualitative and quantitative methods to identify sources of non-market benefits and estimate their monetary value. I propose to begin my work with a series of focus group with residents of Miami-Dade County. The focus groups discussions will explore residents’ general attitudes toward farmland and farmland preservation and their reaction to alternative development scenarios. Following the focus groups, I will develop a questionnaire that will be sent to a representative random sample of Miami-Dade County residents. The mail survey will quantify county residents’ preferences for farmland preservation and apply the contingent valuation method to estimate the monetary value of farmland.

Focus Groups

Focus groups are discussions with small groups of people that are carefully structured to explore specific issues. I use focus groups primarily to help develop a questionnaire that elicits the monetary value of farmland preservation. Collecting useful information from surveys requires that the questionnaire communicate about issues that are meaningful to respondents and in language that is clearly understood. I use the focus group discussions to find out what land use issues are relevant and important to area residents and to learn the concepts and language they use to describe those issues.

Specifically, the focus group discussions will address participants' perceptions of farmland and other open space, the importance of farmland preservation, and the acceptability of alternative preservation/development scenarios.

I intend to recruit participants for six focus groups that will be held throughout Miami-Dade County. I expect I will conduct two groups (one in English and one in Spanish) in urban Miami. I plan to conduct four additional groups (three in English and one in Spanish) in other areas of the county. Each group will consist of eight to ten randomly chosen participants.

Contingent Valuation Survey

As I mentioned, I will use the focus groups to help develop a survey instrument that will communicate effectively and meaningfully with potential respondents. The survey will likely be administered by mail to a large random sample of county residents. The survey will gather data to quantify attitudes toward farmland preservation and the four development scenarios and to estimate the monetary value associated with farmland preservation and each of the four scenarios.

A key part of questionnaire will be a contingent valuation scenario designed to elicit monetary values associated with farmland preservation and alternative development scenarios. Contingent valuation is an widely used valuation technique that asks people directly how much they are willing to pay for access to a particular non-market good or service. Application of the contingent valuation method first carefully describes the good or service of interest. It then describes a market-like setting that gives respondents an opportunity to choose between money and provision of the non-market good or service. The choice reveals how much a person is willing to pay for the good or service.

As an example, let me describe how I've measured the monetary value of farmland preservation in other studies. The questionnaires I developed first described current conditions relative to farmland and development. The description included the amount of farmland in the county, the pace of development and farmland loss, and the positive and negative impacts of agricultural practices in the study area. The questionnaire then carefully described how a purchase of development rights program works to preserve farmland and proposed a specific PDR program for the study area. The questionnaire then asked the respondent whether they would vote for or against a referendum that would increase taxes for their household by a specified amount in order to support the described PDR program. The yes/no responses to a range of proposed program costs provide the information necessary to estimate monetary value.

Final Report

My final report will thoroughly document the procedures used and results. In particular, it will document Miami-Dade County residents' attitudes toward farmland preservation and toward the four specific development/preservation scenarios. The attitude information will include statistics on the perceived importance of farmland preservation, preferred preservation objectives, and the acceptability of alternative development scenarios. A key part of the report will be the estimates of average willingness to pay for farmland preservation and estimates of the proportion of Miami-Dade County residents who would support a farmland preservation program as a function of the per household cost of the program.

The results will aid in designing a farmland preservation strategy that addresses the preferences of county residents. Estimates of monetary value will contribute to a full accounting of the non-market benefits associated with farmland preservation and with the four development scenarios. Finally, the yes/no responses to the contingent valuation scenario will provide estimates of the level of support for an actual referendum on farmland preservation.

Study Objectives

- Utilize contingent valuation to estimate the economic value of non-market benefits provided by agricultural, open and rural lands and uses in the study area.
- Incorporate non-market values into the cost-benefit analysis to more fully quantify the impacts, positive or negative, of implementing scenarios.

Economic Benefits of Agriculture

- Market benefits
- Value of crops
- Employment & wages
- Revenue to processors & support industries
- Non-market benefits
- Scenic beauty & rural character
- Quality of life
- Wildlife habitat

Methods

- Qualitative (focus groups)
- Quantitative (surveys)

Focus Groups

- Details
- Six groups of randomly chosen participants
- Two groups in Miami, four elsewhere in the county
- Four in English, two in Spanish
- Objectives
- Identify important land use issues
- Learn to communicate effectively about issues

Contingent Valuation Survey

- Details
- Large-scale mail survey of random sample of Miami-Dade County residents
- Questionnaires in English and Spanish
- Objectives
- Quantify preferences for farmland preservation
- Estimate monetary value of non-market benefits of alternative scenarios

Final Report & Results

- Describe attitudes toward farmland preservation
- Help design a program that addresses preferences of county residents
- Estimate willingness to pay for development scenarios
- Contribute to a full accounting of the non-market benefits of farmland preservation
- Estimate support for farmland preservation
- Estimate outcome of referendum on farmland preservation

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL AREA STUDY, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

AGENDA FOR CAC MEETING

October 18th 2001, 6:30p.m.

**Miami-Dade County Agriculture Center Auditorium,
18710 SW 288th Street, Homestead, Florida**

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| I. | Call to Order | Craig Wheeling (Chair) |
| II. | Approval of Agenda and Minutes | 5 minutes |
| III. | Important Issues that need to be addressed
in Consultant Studies (eg.: suitability criteria review) | Pat Bidol-Padva (Facilitator)
(45 mins.) |
| IV. | FLC Components of Study (Tasks 1d., 1e., 2., 3b.) | Frielich, Leitner & Carlisle, &
Pat Bidol-Padva (45 mins.) |
| V. | Other Business | 5 minutes |
| VI. | Public Comments | 20 minutes |
| VII. | Adjourn | |